

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-45 were originally submitted. Claims 1-9, 11-15, 17-22, 24-34, 36-43, and 44-50 remain pending in the application, with claims 1, 12, 19, 26, and 38 being independent. Applicant amends independent claims 1, 12, 19, 26, and 38 to clarify claimed subject matter. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure. No new matter has been added.

Applicant cancels claims 10, 16, 23, 35, and 44 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter.

Applicant adds claims 46-50 to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. The original specification and drawings support these claim amendments at least at paragraphs 0041-0043 and in Figure 5b. Therefore, claims 46-50 are presented and directed to subject matter of the original disclosure. Again, these revisions introduce no new matter.

## **AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION**

Applicant amends the specification as discussed during the interview. Specifically, Applicant removed reference to “communications media” in paragraphs 0053 and 0055. Applicant amends the specification to replace “media” and “medium” in paragraphs 0053 and 0054 to read “tangible media” and “tangible medium,” respectively. As discussed during the interview, Applicant understands that the Office will withdraw

the §101 rejection in response to these amendments to the specification and corresponding amendments to the claims.

### **§101 REJECTIONS**

**A. Claims 1-11 and 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant understood the Examiner to indicate during the interview that removal of the §101 rejection of claim 19 would lead to removal of the §101 rejection of claims 1-17. In light of the discussion of claim 19 below, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §101 rejection of claims 1-17.

**B. Claims 19-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and only in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant amends independent claim 19. Amended claim 19 recites “One of more computer-readable *storage* media *having a tangible component...*” (emphasis added). Support for this amendment is found at least in paragraph 0054 of the application as originally filed. Applicant also amends dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 to each recite “computer-readable *storage* media as defined in Claim 21” (emphasis added).

Applicant understood the Office to indicate during the interview that the above amendments would lead to removal of the §101 rejection of claims 19-25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §101 rejection of claims 19-25.

**C. Claims 26-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and only in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant amends independent claims 26 and 38 as discussed below. Applicant asserts that the amendments to claims 26 and 38 obviate the §101 rejection by reciting an apparatus with tangible elements and functional interrelationship between the elements of the apparatus. Amended claim 26 recites in part, “an apparatus comprising: means for processing; [and] means for storing information in memory coupled to the means for processing....” Amended claim 38 recites in part, “a computing device comprising: one or more processors; [and] a memory coupled to the one or more processors....” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §101 rejection of claims 26-45.

#### **§112 SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS**

**Claims 1-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, as allegedly being indefinite.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The meaning of “managed code” is discussed at least in paragraph 0003 of the application as originally filed. When read in light of the specification, the meaning of “managed code” is particularly pointed out and distinctly claimed. Applicant understood the Office to indicate during the interview that this rejection would be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejections be withdrawn.

## **§102 REJECTIONS**

**Claims 1-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,915,085 (Koved).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, **independent claim 1** has been amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be allowable. Support for this amendment is found at least in claim 10 of the application as originally filed. There is no new matter.

**Independent claim 1**, as amended, recites a method:

to estimate security requirements needed to execute managed code comprising:

simulating the execution of all execution paths of one or more assemblies in managed code, wherein the managed code is a managed shared library or an executable; and

*finding a set of required permissions for each execution path by one or more simulated stack walks that each include a plurality of the assemblies, wherein each call in each execution path has a corresponding permissions set.*  
(emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed by Koved.

Koved is directed to automatically determining “access rights required by Java programs or libraries ... *[using] a modified interprocedural invocation graph*, called an access rights invocation graph (ARIG), *to compute the access rights*” (page 2, column 1, first paragraph)(emphasis added). Koved describes searching through a finite set of types with *a computation that “converges to a unique fixed point in finite time*, regardless of

the order in which we visit the nodes in the invocation graph” (page 4, column 1, third paragraph)(emphasis added). Furthermore, in Koved “[e]ach Java application *class* is loaded into the Java Virtual Machine and is *associated with a set of rights*, or privileges” (page 3, column 1, third paragraph). However, Koved fails to disclose “finding a set of required permissions for each execution path by one or *more simulated stack walks that each include a plurality of the assemblies, wherein each call in each execution path has a corresponding permissions set*,” as recited in Applicant’s amended independent claim 1 (emphasis added). The method of identifying permissions and granularity to which permissions are assigned to code are different between Koved and Applicant’s claims.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least the foregoing reasons and therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its §102 rejection of claim 1.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, **independent claim 12** has been amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be allowable. Support for this amendment is found at least in claim 16 of the application as originally filed. There is no new matter.

**Independent claim 12** is directed to a method, and is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. For example, Koved fails to disclose “*wherein the simulation comprises one or more simulated stack walks that include two or more of the assemblies*,” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its §102 rejection of claim 12.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, **independent claim 19** has been amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be allowable. Support for this amendment is found at least in claim 23 of the application as originally filed. There is no new matter.

**Independent claim 19** is directed to computer-readable storage media, and is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. For example, Koved fails to disclose “*wherein the simulation of the execution comprises, for each data and control flow for the managed code, one or more simulated stack walks that include two or more of the assemblies,*” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its §102 rejection of claim 19.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, **independent claim 26** has been amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be allowable. Support for this amendment is found at least in claim 35, paragraphs 0045, 0047, and Figure 6 of the application as originally filed. There is no new matter.

**Independent claim 26** is directed to an apparatus, and is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. For example, Koved fails to disclose “*wherein the means for simulating the execution performs, for each execution path, one or more simulated stack walks that each include a plurality of assemblies,*” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 26. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its §102 rejection of claim 26.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, **independent claim 38** has been amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be allowable. Support for this amendment is found at least in claim 44, paragraphs 0025, 0045, 0047, and Figure 6 of the application as originally filed. There is no new matter.

**Independent claim 38** is directed to a computing, and is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. For example, Koved fails to disclose “*wherein the simulation of the execution comprises one or more simulated stack walks that each include a plurality of the assemblies,*” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 38. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its §102 rejection of claim 38.

Applicant amends independent claims 1, 12, 19, 26, and 38 to recite features formerly recited in dependent claims 10, 16, 23, 35, and 44, respectively. **Dependent claims 10, 16, 23, 35, and 44** are cancelled without prejudice, waiver or disclaimer of the subject matter.

**Dependent claims 11, 18, 20-22, and 24-25** are amended to remove the Office’s §101 rejection of these claims. Each of the above listed claims depends from an allowable base claim and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that it recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its §101 and §102 rejections of claims 11, 18, 20-22, and 24-25.

**Dependent claims 13, 21, 27, 30, 40, and 41** are amended to correct minor informalities. These amendments are not made in response to a rejection or objection

from the Office. Each of the above listed claims depends from an allowable base claim and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that it recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its §102 rejections of claims 13, 21, 27, 30, 40, and 41.

**Dependent claim 36** is amended to change its dependency from cancelled claim 35 to claim 26, and to correct a minor informality. This amendment is not made in response to a rejection or objection from the Office. Claim 36 depends from an allowable base claim and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that it recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its §102 rejection of claim 36.

**Dependent claims 2-9, 14-15, 17, 28-29, 31-34, 37, 39, 42-43, and 45** each depend from an allowable independent base claim and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that each recites. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its §102 rejections of claims 2-9, 14-15, 17, 28-29, 31-34, 37, 39, 42-43, and 45. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of every dependent claim.

Applicant asserts Koved fails to anticipate independent Claims 1, 12, 19, 26, and 38 because Koved does not disclose the recited features of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

#### **NEW CLAIMS 46-50**

**Applicant adds claims 46-50 to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter.** The original specification and drawings support these claim amendments at least



at paragraphs 0041-0043 and Figure 5b. Claims 46-50 are presented and directed to subject matter of the original disclosure. Therefore, these additions introduce no new matter.

### **CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-9, 11-15, 17-22, 24-34, 36-43, and 45-50 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative to resolve the issue before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Date: February 7, 2007

By: /Benjamin Keim/  
Benjamin A. Keim  
Reg. No. 59,217  
(509) 324-9256 x248